

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing reasons which follow.

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-41 are pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-18, 21-36, and 38-41 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollingsworth (US 6,837,346) in view of Yamamoto et al. (US5,911,441). Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully submit that such claims are allowable in their current form.

Claim 1 covers a releasable fastening mechanism generally extending along the mouth and two sides of the pocket. Applicants submit that Hollingsworth in combination with Yamamoto or any other cited reference fails to teach or suggest such an element.

The Examiner admits that Hollingsworth “fails to teach the releasable fastening mechanism extending generally along said mouth and two sides” of the pocket. The Examiner then cites Yamamoto et al. as a teaching of the use of hook and loop pads or strips, instead of a zipper. However, since Hollingsworth already employs a hook and loop fastener in relation to the pocket, it is unclear how Yamamoto et al. helps to overcome the admitted shortfall of Hollingsworth. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness with respect to claim 1, based upon Hollingsworth in view of Yamamoto et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 22 covers a first releasable fastening mechanism positioned to releasably join the first panel and the first cover and a second releasable fastening mechanism positioned to releasably join the second panel and the first cover. Applicants submit that

Hollingsworth in combination with Yamamoto or any other cited reference fails to teach or suggest such an element combination.

The Examiner contends that Hollingsworth “teaches a pocket (86...) coupled to said first cover via panel (28)” and “teaches a first releasable fastening mechanism (43, 43’) positioned between the front panel and first cover and a second releasable fastening mechanism (92).” The Examiner further contends that “the first panel (28)” is “releasably attached to the first side of the first cover (16) by fastening elements (43, 43’)” and that “the second panel (88)” is “releasably attachable to the second side of the first cover by fastening elements (94, 94’).” However, based upon the part labeling assigned by the Examiner, Hollingsworth does not actually disclose or suggest a second fastening mechanism that releasably joins the second panel and the first cover. In particular, the so-called second panel is actually releasably attached to the so-called first panel, not the first cover, as per claim 22. Thus, the subject matter of claim 22 is neither taught nor suggested by Hollingsworth.

Similar to claim 1, Yamamoto et al. is unable to overcome the shortcomings associated with Hollingsworth. Accordingly, Hollingsworth in view of Yamamoto et al. fails to render obvious the subject matter of claim 22.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 22 and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 26, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case for obviousness under 35 USC §103(a). In particular, the Examiner has failed to point out which element or elements are not disclosed by the primary reference, Hollingsworth, as per the standards set forth in *Graham v. John Deere, Co.* (383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966)). Specifically, the Examiner has not ascertained the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. Thus, barring a proper showing, Applicants submit that claim 26 and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claim 34 shows an inner pocket panel that includes a protruding portion that protrudes outwardly beyond the opening in the component so as to prevent the inner pocket panel from being pulled through the opening. Applicants submit that Hollingsworth in combination with Yamamoto or any other cited reference fails to teach or suggest such an element combination.

Hollingsworth discloses an inner panel 86 that is able to selectively be extended into or withdrawn from the interior compartment 14. There is no component, panel, etc. having an opening through which the inner panel is not able to traverse as a result of the size thereof. Thus, Hollingsworth fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 34.

Similar to claim 1, Yamamoto et al. is unable to overcome the shortcomings associated with Hollingsworth. Accordingly, Hollingsworth in view of Yamamoto et al. fails to render obvious the subject matter of claim 34.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 34 and those claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollingsworth (US 6,837,346) in view of Yamamoto et al. (US5,911,441) and further in view of Moor (US 6,547,283). Claims 19, 20, and 37 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollingsworth (US 6,837,346) in view of Yamamoto et al. (US5,911,441) and further in view of Carrasco (US 2,778,397). However, claims 12, 19, and 20 depend from allowable claim 1, and claim 37 depends from allowable claim 34. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 12, 19, 20, and 37 are in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

As per MPEP § 706.07(a), it would not be proper to make the next action Final if a new grounds of rejection were to be used to reject any of the pending claims, as such a rejection would not have been necessitated by amendment and/or by an IDS.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to 132512. If a fee is required for an extension of time under CFR § 1.136 that is not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Knapp/

Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Agent for Applicants
Telephone No. (919) 334-3374

MeadWestvaco Corporation
Law Department
1021 Main Campus Drive
Raleigh, NC 27606
E-mail: jtk13@meadwestvaco.com
Telephone: (919) 334-3374
Facsimile: (919) 834-0844